

**REMARKS**

Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, and 16-18, amended claims 1, 13, and claim 20 are in this application.

Claims 1-5, 11-13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,503 (Margulis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,503 (Naka et al.), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0202006 (Callway), U.S. Patent No. 5,557,338 (Maze et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,460,181 (Donnelly).

Each of independent claims 1 and 13 (from which claims 2-5, 11, and 16 depend) has been amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"wherein the secondary display is operable to display on a single screen thereof a plurality of index images each representative of a captured image of a respective program so as to enable the index images of a plurality of different programs to be displayed on the single screen of the secondary display, and contents obtained from television broadcast and the Internet can be selected for display, and"  
(Emphasis added.)

It is believed that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1 (and to claim 13). With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to line 7 of page 23 to line 3 of page 25 and Fig. 7 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above-identified

features now recited in claim 1. That is, the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly does not appear to disclose "the secondary display is operable to display on a single screen thereof a plurality of index images each representative of a captured image of a respective program so as to enable the index images of a plurality of different programs to be displayed on the single screen of the secondary display . . ." as in claim 1. More specifically, in section 2 of the present Office Action, the Examiner appears to assert that Donnelly (and in particular line 57 of column 10 to line 42 of column 11 thereof) discloses a secondary display "operable to display . . . ." (See lines 8+ of section 2 of page 2 of the present Office Action.) Such portions of Donnelly do not appear to disclose that "the secondary display is operable to display on a single screen thereof a plurality of index images each representative of a captured image of a respective program so as to enable the index images of a plurality of different programs to be displayed on the single screen of the secondary display . . ." as in claim 1.

In other words, the system of claim 1 has two displays-----that is, a primary display apparatus and a secondary display apparatus, which may communicate with each other. The secondary display may display a plurality of index images each representative of a captured image of a respective program. Such display may be used by a user to select a desired program. As is to be appreciated, such use of the images on the secondary display may eliminate the need to switch the channels and examine the contents of the program during a selection operation, thereby making it more convenient for the user to preview a plurality of programs and select the program desired.

It should be noted that although Fig. 4 and the description thereof in the portion of Donnelly relied on by the Examiner appears to disclose a description screen 640 having a

description area 645 which can display description text, such items appear to pertain to "the selected channel." (See line 37 of column 11 of Donnelly.) On the other hand and as indicated above, in the system of claim 1 a plurality of index images each representative of a captured image of a respective program may be displayed on the secondary display. Also, it is respectfully submitted that the description text, or icons and advertisements mentioned in the portion of Donnelly relied on by the Examiner are substantially different from the index images of claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 13 is also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly.

Claims 2-5, 11, and 16 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-5, 11, and 16 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway, Maze et al., and Donnelly as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836 (Huang et al.).

Claim 8 is dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claim 8 is also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to

rely on Huang to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Donnelly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze, Donnelly and Huang.

Claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway, Maze et al., and Donnelly as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0187885 (Miyazaki et al.).

Claims 6 and 9 are dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 6 and 9 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Miyazaki to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Donnelly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 9 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze, Donnelly and Miyazaki.

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway, Maze et al., and Donnelly as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,622 (Lan et al.).

Claims 17 and 18 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 17 and 18 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Lan to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Donnelly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 18 are distinguishable

from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze, Donnelly and Lan.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis (U.S. Patent 6,263,503) in view of Donnelly (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,181).

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 20 is also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis and Donnelly.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/524,175

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-396

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 5, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Dennis M.  
Smid, Esq./

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

1154392\_LDOC